

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiesa: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/585,766	07/12/2006	Masashi Onishi	58546.00030	7887	
32294 7590 8 909052908 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSY L.L.P. 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE 14TH FLOOR VIENNA, VA 22182-6212			EXAMINER		
			LUK, EMMANUEL S		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Thirting The Barbar Obsta			1791		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/06/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## 10/585,766 ONISHI ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit

Application No.

Applicant(s)

		Emmanuel S. Luk	1791				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
Period for Reply  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be limely filed in the communication of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be limely filed in the communication of the commun							
Status							
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 M</u> . This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allower	action is non-final.	secution as to the	e merits is			
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
A) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Applicati	ion Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureat.	s have been received. s have been received in Applicativity documents have been received in (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No  ed in this National	Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)						

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-SECS)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/12/06; 5/16/08.

4) 🗌	Interview Summary (PTO-413)

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/585,766

Art Unit: 1791

## DETAILED ACTION

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148
   USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- Claims 1, 4-6, 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 11-170319.
- JP '319 teaches an injection molding machine with a motor and brake unit 16, the brake unit includes an electromagnet 35, the brake unit also having a hollow output shaft, see Figure 6, element 106.
  - JP '319 fails to specifically teach a brake torque greater than
- However, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the need for the brake unit to generate greater torque over the torque provided by the motor such that it would sufficiently brake the motor and drive unit.

Application/Control Number: 10/585,766

Art Unit: 1791

4. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

JP 11-170319 as applied to claims 1, 4-6, and 8-13 above, and further in view of JP

2003-117970.

JP '319 fails to teach the controllers.

JP '970 shows the use of controllers for an electromagnetic brake used in an

injection molding machine, the brakes being controlled according to the time sequence,

see Figure 3. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify JP

'319 with a controller taught by JP '970 that allows for exact timing for control of the

brakes and for the operation of the machine.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would

be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject

matter: The prior art of record fails to teach an injection molding unit with a motor

having a brake unit that also drives the ejector apparatus, the ejector apparatus having

a return spring to bias the ejector pin opposite the direction the ejector pin is projected,

the brake unit generating the torque greater than the biasing force of the return spring.

Application/Control Number: 10/585,766 Page 4

Art Unit: 1791

## Conclusion

 The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. 5.645.868

US Patent No. 5.879.597

US Patent No. 7.114,940

 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel S. Luk whose telephone number is (571)272-1134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Fridays from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300

Application/Control Number: 10/585,766 Page 5

Art Unit: 1791

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Yogendra N Gupta/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791

FΙ